

REMARKS

As a preliminary matter, claims 17 and 18 stand objected to for informalities. In response, Applicants have amended claims 17 and 18 to correct for the noted informalities, and respectfully traverse. Reconsideration and withdrawal in light of these amendments are respectfully requested.

Claims 1-20 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Takaishi (U.S. 5,859,742). Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection because the present invention is drawn toward performing settling control of head position, whereas the cited reference is not.

The Takaishi reference discloses a seek control method for performing a long distance seek that switches from long distance seek with velocity control to a short distance seek with a feed-forward current control and a target trajectory control. (See col. 6, lines 4-64). The Examiner cites lines 22-57 of column 6 of the reference only for teaching the features of settling control of actuator. This portion of cited text, however, shows no such features.

The cited portion of text, in fact, describes only speed control (line 26), long distance seek control (line 35), and short distance seek control (lines 35-36). Nowhere does this portion of cited text describe settling control. The cited portion of text only mentions settling at all in reference to a measurement from the start of a seek to the end of settling. (See col. 6, lines 58-59). This single measurement, however, can by no means be correctly interpreted to be "settling control."

In contrast claims 1 and 11 of the present invention as amended both recite, among other things, the performance of settling control. The portion of text cited by the Examiner from the prior art reference does not disclose any such settling control. Accordingly, for at least these reasons, the Section 102 rejection of claims 1 and 11 is respectfully traversed.

Claims 3 and 13 have been cancelled without prejudice, rendering the rejection thereto now moot. Claims 2 and 4 depend from independent claim 1, and claims 12 and 14 depend from independent claim 11, and therefore contain all of the features of the respective base claims, plus additional features. Accordingly, the rejection of claims 2, 4, 12, and 14 is respectfully traversed for at least the reasons discussed above in traversing the rejection of independent claim 1 and 11.

With respect to claim 12 in particular, however, the rejection is respectfully traversed because the cited portion of text (col. 6, lines 33-37) does not teach or suggest to supply at least a target trajectory or feed forward current that is proportional to the initial position or initial velocity at the start of settling.

The portion of text cited by the Examiner with respect to claim 12 merely describes a switch from the long distance seek to the short distance seek according to the velocity of the head, and to determine the feed-forward current to make the head speed zero. Making the head speed zero, however, is not the same as supplying a target trajectory or current that is proportional to the initial position or initial velocity at the start of the settling, as in claim 12 of the present invention. The Examiner has not even

asserted that this proportional trajectory or current must always be zero. For at least these additional reasons, the rejection of claim 12 of the present invention is respectfully traversed.

Additionally, although Applicants do not agree with the Examiner's interpretation of the cited portion of text from the prior art reference, in the interest of expediting prosecution, Applicants have further amended independent claims 1 and 11 to more clearly recite the settling control features of the present invention. Applicants therefore request additional consideration of these claims from the Examiner in light of this amendment.

With respect to independent claims 5 and 15, Applicants have amended independent claims 5 and 15 to clarify that the generation of position trajectory and feed-forward current based on the current position and the current velocity of the head is performed at the start of settling. The cited prior art reference neither teaches nor suggests such a specific features related to the start of settling. As discussed above, the cited reference merely describes a measurement until the end of settling. The reference in no way describes any other functions of the device or method related to the start of settling. Accordingly, for at least these reasons as well, the Section 102 rejection of claims 5 and 15 is respectfully traversed.

Claims 6-10 depend from independent claim 5, and claims 16-20 depend from independent claim 15, and therefore the rejections of these claims is respectfully traversed for at least the reasons discussed above with respect to claims 5 and 15.


The remaining claims of the present invention have been amended to correct for typographical errors only, and not in response to any rejections or objections to the claims.

For all the foregoing reasons, Applicants submit that this Application, including claims 1-2, 4-12, and 14-20, is in condition for allowance, which is respectfully requested. The Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned attorney if an interview would expedite prosecution.

Respectfully submitted,

GREER, BURNS & CRAIN, LTD.

By


Josh C. Snider
Registration No. 47,954

Customer No. 24978

August 12, 2003

300 South Wacker Drive
Suite 2500
Chicago, Illinois 60606
Telephone: 312.360.0080
Facsimile: 312.360.9315

K:\3408\64941\Amend.A.doc